

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 5-7 have been amended to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending with claims 3 and 4 having been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants respectfully assert that support for amended claims 1 and 5-7 may be found, for example, in FIGs. 1-5, as well as corresponding pages of the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claims 1 and 5-7 do not introduce new matter.

**Interview Summary**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview conducted on May 4, 2010. During the interview, discussions focused on amending independent claim 1 to clarify the individual features of the claimed invention, as well as possible language to distinguish over the applied prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the present amendments to the claims are commensurate with the discussions held during the interview. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claim 1 patentably defines over the applied prior art, as discussed during the personal interview.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

On pages 2 to 3 of the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being

anticipated by De Puy (US 3,466,743) and claims 1 and 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Davis (US 3,656,378). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for producing a winding, particularly for an electrical transformer from a cylindrical tubular metal element of polygonal cross-section having side surfaces including, in part, a step of “machining, in a first series of passes, a first series of cuts substantially parallel to one another *through each of the side surfaces, except for one of the side surfaces of the tubular element with the first series of cuts, being substantially perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the tubular element,*” (emphasis added).

In direct contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, De Puy merely discloses simultaneously performing parallel rectilinear cuts 4 through side surfaces at an angle with a longitudinal axis of the tubular blank 1. Here, De Puy explicitly requires, at col. 3, lines 13-26, that the series of rectilinear cuts must be inclined or angled to a right cross-sectional plane of the tubular blank. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully asserts that De Puy fails to teach or suggest a method for producing a winding including at least a step of machining a first series of cuts “being substantially perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the

tubular element," as required by at least amended independent claim 1.

In further contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Davis merely discloses, in FIGs. 9-12, consecutively cutting each of four walls 22-25 of a tubular member 20 using a circular saw 45. Here, Davis explicitly requires that the axis A of the saw 45 is at a slight angle to plane B extending longitudinally midway between the sides 23 and 25 and perpendicular to the side 24. As disclosed at col. 2, lines 70-73 and as shown in FIGs. 9 and 10 of Davis, the tubular member is formed by successive angular cuts in the walls 22-25 using the saw 45 at an angle with respect to a longitudinal axis of the tubular member 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Davis fails to teach or suggest a method for producing a winding including at least a step of machining a first series of cuts "being substantially perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the tubular element," as required by at least amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Davis fails to anticipate the combination of features recited by at least independent claim 1, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully assert that De Puy and Davis, whether taken individually or combined, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation and/or obviousness of at least amended independent

claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

This Response is believed to be fully responsive and to place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the Amendment, and an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Should the Examiner believe that any matters need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/David B. Hardy/  
David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362  
209 Madison Street  
Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

DBH/fb